

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-4, 7-18, 20-22 will remain pending in this application. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added in the above amendments.

Claims 1-8, 13, 18-19, and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0076036 (“Le”). Claims 11-12 and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Le. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Le in view of United States Patent 6,477,536 (“Pasumansky et al.”). Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Le in view of United States Patent 6,785,689 (“Daniel et al.”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Interview Summary

Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Angela Lie participated in a telephonic interview on May 31, 2007 to discuss the above claim amendments, and agreement was reached.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-8, 13, 18-19, and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0076036 (“Le”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The present application discloses techniques for linking objects of a source datastore and a target datastore, as well as between two objects in a target datastore. The objects may, for example, be a dimension or a measure group. One aspect of the techniques is to specify a persistence model which controls how changes to the linked objects are handled. In particular, it will be noted at paragraphs 0054-0056 of the specification that the persistence property may be designated as “metadata,” “data/fully persisted,” or “not persisted.”

The first option involves metadata of the linked object being retrieved and persisted. In this case, the metadata in the target datastore is not changed until the next time

the object is processed or altered. It will be understood by those skilled in the art that the term “metadata” involves information about data. This is contrasted by the actual data of the object. The second persistence option is for the metadata and data of the object to be retrieved and persisted. This means that the metadata and data continue to exist in the target datastore and retain their values between runs of the program. Lastly, neither the metadata nor the data is persisted so that changes to the source object are fully dynamic. Accordingly, any change made to the source datastore may be propagated to the linked object.

The Le reference discloses a technique for updating data cubes using hierarchical dependency relationships to identify areas of the data that have changed and refreshing only the data that has been affected by the change. Clearly, this technique involves any change in the data for one object being automatically or dynamically updated throughout the linked objects at various levels by means of the efficient update module (see paragraph 0038 in Le). There are no options as to how data will be persisted in linked objects of the hierarchy. Instead, the only mention of how often changes are made to the data relates to the refresh cycle at paragraphs 0048-0049 of the reference.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Le reference does not teach or suggest “specifying a persistence model for controlling how changes to the linked source object are handled by the linked target object,” as recited in independent claims 1, 13 and 22. Further, Le does not disclose the specific options stated for the persistence model in such claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 13, and 22 are not anticipated by Le. Applicants further submit that claims 2-4, 7-8, and 18 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Claims 5-6 and 19 are hereby cancelled. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11-12 and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Le. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Le in view of United States Patent 6,477,536 (“Pasumansky et al.”). Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable

DOCKET NO.: 306352.01 / MSFT-2863
Application No.: 10/750,205
Office Action Dated: March 21, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

over Le in view of United States Patent 6,785,689 ("Daniel et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Pursuant to the amendments of independent claims 1 and 13 and the arguments set forth above, Applicants submit that claims 9-12, 14-17, and 20 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency therefrom. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: 306352.01 / MSFT-2863
Application No.: 10/750,205
Office Action Dated: March 21, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

Date: July 23, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439